

5405. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, Wis., opposing the repeal of the Neutrality Act in its present form; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5406. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., opposing the repeal of the Neutrality Act in its present form; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5407. By Mr. BREWSTER: Petition of 121 signatures, protesting against the discontinuance of the Federal theater project in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5408. Also, petition containing 17 signatures, protesting against the discontinuance of the Federal theater project in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5409. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution adopted by the Bergen County Women's Republican Club, Hackensack, N. J., opposing profiteering in commodities on either a small or large scale; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5410. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. C. Newman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Work Projects Administration laws; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5411. Also, petition of Alfred M. Kunze, of New Rochelle, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5412. Also, petition of Sheila MacDonald, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5413. Also, petition of the Grace Methodist Church, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the elimination of the gambling ships from off the California coast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5414. Also, petition of the city and county of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on the Territories.

5415. Also, petition of the City of New York Board of Estimate, bureau of the secretary, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5416. Also, petition of the Young People's Religious Union, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the work of United States Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., and the special committee of the United States Senate to investigate the violation of civil liberties and the rights of labor; to the Committee on Rules.

5417. Also, petition of the Syrian and Lebanese American Federation of the Eastern States, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to social and political conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5418. Also, petition of J. M. Mills, of Reform, Ala., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to shipping of all weapons and war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5419. Also, petition of the Grand Aerie Fraternal Order of Eagles, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Manitowoc citizenship-day plan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5420. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, 159 State House, Boston, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to slum clearance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5421. Also, petition of the Insular Association of Social Workers of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a state of emergency in the island of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5422. Also, petition of Soldados Industriales Veterans of the World War, of the towns of Yauco, Guanica, and Guayanilla, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a bill for compensation for the industrial workers who answered the call of our Government; to the Committee on War Claims.

5423. Also, petition of the Board of Estimate, Bureau of the Secretary, city of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Works Progress Administration relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5424. Also, petition of A. W. Barels, city clerk, Madison, Dane County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Works Progress Administration relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5425. Also, petition of the Department of Public Safety, Camden, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protective measures to forestall the excessive increase of commodity prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5426. Also, petition of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal securities legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5427. Also, petition of the Windham County Democratic Association, held at Brooklyn, Conn., William Perry Barber, secretary pro tempore, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuance of the New Deal as a Democratic philosophy and desire to perpetuate that philosophy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt through the instrumentality of the Democratic Party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5428. Also, petition of the Utah State Junior Chamber of Commerce, Val D. Hicks, president, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5429. Also, petition of the Provincial Board of Nueva Vizcaya, at Bayombong, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to charges against His Excellency President Manuel L. Quezon; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5430. Also, petition of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Camden, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5431. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of Alabama, Montgomery, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Army officers retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of Love, Lord of our unrecorded days, who standest suppliant at the doors of desire and obedience: Shame us with the sense of our misspent efforts in which fret and strain have but wrought confusion. Teach us the secret of so being alone with ourselves as to find in solitude sources of power, and in the sanctuaries of our own souls Thine assuring presence. So shall we be able to discern Thy will for us; so only canst Thou speak to us above our tumults and our passions, laying anew upon us the sovereign commandment of love which supplies the only temper in which the differences of mankind can be resolved. Help us to realize that the judgments of love are the only sure judgments; that the insights of love are the only clear insights, and that only the law of love, written on the hearts of men, will bring us all in the end to a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

APPEARANCE OF SENATORS

EDWIN C. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of Colorado, ELLISON D. SMITH, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, and ROBERT A. TAFT, a Senator from the State of Ohio, appeared in their seats today.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations met today and adjourned until Thursday in order to give members of the committee an opportunity to study the draft of the bill which has been submitted to the committee. Therefore, after consulting with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the minority

leader, I move the Senate now adjourn until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, September 28, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, before whose face the generations rise and fall and the eternal hills are transient, we praise Thee that there is a divine purpose at the heart of this world; mercy is underneath it, and a gracious Providence is in control of it. Oh, move us toward Thee until we stand on Thy holy hill, firm in faith, strong with hope, and lost in love.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 21, 1939, was read and approved.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES OF SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 384

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, namely:

For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, \$51,000.

For mileage of Representatives, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and for expenses of the Delegate from Alaska, \$171,000.

For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate and 48 pages for the House of Representatives, at \$4 per day each, for the period commencing September 21, 1939, and ending with the last day of the month in which the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourns sine die at the second session thereof, so much as may be necessary for each the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HON. ERNEST MARK POLLARD

Mr. HEINKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEINKE. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the death of the Honorable Ernest Mark Pollard, a former Member of this body. His death occurred at Lincoln, Nebr., on September 24, 1939.

Mr. Pollard was born at Nehawka, Cass County, Nebr., April 15, 1869, the son of a pioneer family. He attended the public schools at Nehawka and graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1893. During an active and busy life he followed agricultural pursuits.

He was a member of the House of Representatives of Nebraska from 1896 to 1899. He was elected to fill the vacancy of the Honorable Elmer J. Burkett in the Fifty-ninth Con-

gress to represent the First District of Nebraska. He was reelected to the Sixtieth Congress and served from July 18, 1905, to March 3, 1909. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Nebraska in 1920 and 1921. He devoted much of his time to public and civic affairs.

In the death of Mr. Pollard, his native State and country has lost an active and useful citizen. His many friends mourn his death.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 302

Resolved, That after September 25, 1939, the House shall meet only on Mondays and Thursdays of each week until October 9, 1939.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein the program adopted by the Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority floor leader whether, under the resolution that has just been adopted, when the House meets on Mondays and Thursdays, as indicated in the resolution, there will be any business transacted or attempted to be transacted at that time?

Mr. RAYBURN. After consultation with the Speaker, the minority leader, and in the absence of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], we have a gentleman's agreement that there will be no legislation taken up on any Monday or Thursday between now and the 9th of October.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. Could it be possible for the majority leader of this House to arrange with the minority leader so that on Mondays and Thursdays, when we do meet, there shall only be permitted general debate on the subject of neutrality, the time to be equally divided between the members of the majority and minority sides?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know that we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that remarks could not be extended or that speeches could not be made on any subject. Of course, I contemplate that for the next 2 weeks those who speak will speak to very small audiences. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in order that it may be in order, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. When he stated that on Mondays there would be no other business taken up, does that mean that the antilynching bill will not be brought up?

Mr. RAYBURN. My understanding is that those who are charged with the responsibility of the antilynching bill have agreed that it will not be called up between now and October 9.

Mr. FISH. I am in accord with the gentleman, but I wanted to understand what his views are.

Mr. RAYBURN. No legislation between now and October 9 is the arrangement, or, I might say, the so-called gentleman's agreement, by those in responsibility.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Is the gentleman able to give the House any assurance as to what will take place after the 9th of October, so that the Members may govern themselves accordingly?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that when we meet on the 9th of October, or probably the Thursday preceding that date, if it can be then seen that there will be no business on the 9th or on the following Thursday, we might announce at that time that the Members may stay at home another week. That is my feeling now.

Mr. MAPES. So that if the Members who desire to go home will keep track of the newspapers, they can perhaps ascertain what will be taken up the week after.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct, probably, but I have offered this resolution to let Members know, and to let their constituents know, that their presence for the next 2 weeks is not necessary.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. To ask the gentleman whether he agrees that if we do not bring up the antilynching bill, we will not lose any of our rights?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; certainly not. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume that Members would like to make some provision for extending their remarks in the RECORD in those interim days when there is no session. Does the gentleman from Texas contemplate making a suggestion to the House with respect to that matter?

Mr. RAYBURN. At the session every 3 days they would probably do that, but there will be no RECORD printed of House proceedings except following those particular meeting days.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, the Senate will be in session and there will be a RECORD published every day.

Mr. RAYBURN. But there will be no RECORD of House proceedings on the days when the House is not in session.

Mr. RANKIN. But I imagine that the gentleman from Illinois refers to the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Members may want to send in some material from home that is quite pertinent information and have that extended in the RECORD as soon as they can have it run off by the Government Printing Office and have it franked to their constituents?

Mr. RAYBURN. If there can be an arrangement or a request made covering that, there certainly will be no objection from me.

Mr. MAPES. As I understand it, the gentleman will have no objection to unanimous-consent requests being made on the days that the House does meet—Mondays and Thursdays—and Members extending their remarks and, within limits, to make speeches.

Mr. RAYBURN. None whatever.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, is it contemplated in the event the other body has not acted upon pending legislation by the 9th of October, that we will continue to recess for 3 days at a time after that?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the further plan would be to notify people in advance of the 9th, as far as possible?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is my intention, unless someone insists upon calling up the so-called antilynching bill. I might say this to the House: After consultation with the Speaker we are requesting the chairmen of the committees not to meet and report legislation during this session of Congress unless conditions should change and there should

be something emergent, and we hope that the chairmen of the committees and the committees will comply with that request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations offered a resolution a few moments ago to pay expenses of the Members in coming here to this session, but it was worded in such a way that I do not believe it will be of any service, because the resolution provides for moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. As the majority leader understands, there is no money in the Treasury. Therefore, how are the Members going to get their expenses here?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, the Members have always been able to draw their salaries and other moneys coming to them in the past.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered over the National Broadcasting System on Saturday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation from Senate Document 346 and also a quotation from the New York Times of September 14, 1922.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Also, Mr. Speaker, a second request, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert certain excerpts from the President's message to Congress on September 21 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by the Honorable Charles Lindbergh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also include in the Appendix an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, issue of November 18, 1933, entitled "Once Burned."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the unanimous-consent requests I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program for today he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on what subject?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to talk about a question which I am certain the gentleman is very much interested in—farm prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some brief excerpts from five letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address I delivered to the Christian Men Builders, of Indianapolis, on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article by Charles Edison, Acting Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on this day, 150 years ago, the Congress, after long and careful consideration, agreed upon the amendments to the Constitution which became the Bill of Rights.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks by including therein a speech made by me on September 10 on the subject Can We Keep Out of War?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a few brief articles written by the late Senator Sherman, of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a speech made by me at Oslo; also a radio speech made by me the other night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MILLER, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, and Mr. VAN ZANDT were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Portland Shopping News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by Hermann Rauschnig in the publication Foreign Affairs of October 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short editorial from the Iowa Legionaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 calendar days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 calendar days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a personal statement to the Members for a moment.

On account of the unexpected call of the special session the Chair is going to ask the indulgence of the House for a few days to return to his own Alabama to attend to some rather personal and pressing matters. The Chair has asked the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] to introduce a resolution on this subject.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 303

Resolved, That Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. SAM RAYBURN as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the House has just reached a decision to adjourn until the Senate disposes of the pending neutrality bill. In effect it is an agreement not to consider other legislation at this session, an agreement of particular significance just at this time in view of the fact that it postpones until the regular session a proposed measure which has occasioned wide discussion in the press and over the radio, and to which some of the departments and others have been devoting considerable time since the beginning of the European war.

Here are some of the comments referred to:

"Legislation to prevent profiteering, particularly in the necessities of life, during the war emergency, has been virtually completed by the Department of Justice and will be offered in the special session of Congress if the situation demands," said the Attorney General.

A Justice Department official said a policy of "potential enforcement" of antitrust laws would be used to combat profiteering in foodstuffs as a result of the present European conflict.

The forthcoming special session of Congress may give the Agriculture Department authority to combat profiteering. The Department of Justice is now conducting a study along these lines.

And there is daily reference in the press to work of the Department of Justice in formulating proposed legislation and devising administrative machinery to freeze prices and curb profiteering—always with reference to foodstuffs and the cost of living or the delegation of authority to the Department of Agriculture which indicates that it was to be directed to the control of farm products and the prices of farm products.

The Department of Agriculture has been hardly less active in the consideration of ways and means to restrict the range of farm prices. Among the many reports on the earnest concern of the Department have been news releases to the effect that—

An Advisory Council for Agriculture, with producers, processors, and distributors represented, will sit September 19. Consideration will be given to prevention of profiteering (not reasonable price advances), to margins, and similar subjects. It is to be remembered

that there is a Consumers' Council in Agriculture—long inactive but ready to be the medium of "control" of prices by publicity.

Efforts have been made to prevent profiteering inside the United States. Official worry over prospect of sharp rises in the cost of living, particularly foods, which lead to pressure on retail prices, may lead to new controls.

The agricultural advisory committee thinks it should be made a permanent organization, feeling that thus it will be able pretty well to handle any price extravagances that may appear in the agricultural field.

And, in addition, the Department of Agriculture has always been ready to assure the public at every intimation of a rise in farm prices that there are vast surpluses or at least ample supplies of all foodstuffs, the inescapable conclusion being that there is no occasion for paying any more for farm products than the subparity price the farmer has been receiving all along. That is one respect in which the Department of Agriculture has always differed from the other departments—whether under Republican or Democratic administration—its deep concern for the consumer—and as between the farmer and the consumer, the latter always seemed to receive first consideration. Of course, each department of the Government was created to serve all the people, but I have yet to note in all the years I have been in Washington an instance in which the Department of Commerce has exhibited special apprehension lest the manufacturers receive a parity price for their products.

And the Department of Labor has never, to my knowledge, issued bulletins in behalf of the consumer when the question of a fair wage scale for labor was under consideration. And I have no quarrel with them on that score. The two Departments are charged primarily with the duty of conserving the respective interests of industry and labor and are to be commended on the efficiency with which they discharge that duty. My only concern in the present emergency is that the Department of Agriculture be as considerate of the interests of agriculture—and especially since agriculture for the last 10 years has been compelled to accept returns so far out of line with those received by labor and industry, and in many instances below the cost of production.

The newspapers have also carried statements from the labor organizations commenting critically on increases in the price of foodstuffs. According to press reports:

Sharp rises in living costs are being closely studied by both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. leaders. Their idea is to move to reopen old wage contracts if prices get too far out of line.

And President Green of the A. F. of L.—for whom I have the warmest regard and the deepest admiration because he serves his constituency loyally and effectively—said on Saturday, the 23d:

The American Federation of Labor will take action at its coming convention in Cincinnati to curb war profiteering—

And much more in the same tenor, with the idea of holding down the cost of living, of which the principal items, of course, are the products of the farm.

Now, what has brought about this feverish activity on the part of the departments and this searching inquiry on the part of consumer organizations with reference to the price of farm products? The occasion is so small as to be laughable were it not fraught with an import so menacing as to threaten the greatest industry of the Nation with virtual confiscation. In naked terms it proposes a discrimination that amounts to exploitation of rural America.

Here is the occasion for this widespread denunciation and the arbitrary position taken by the departments and the organized industries of the Nation leading up to plans to enact restrictive legislation for the control of farm prices. Since the opening of the European war, wheat has advanced 21 cents a bushel; hogs, \$2.20 a hundred pounds; lambs, \$1.35 a hundred pounds; steers, \$1.35 a hundred pounds; and cotton, \$5 a bale. Since these top prices values have receded somewhat. But this is the cause of the departmental releases and the drafting of punitive laws to freeze farm prices—and the farmer at the same time.

And the astonishing feature of the whole drive to restrict farm prices is that all of them—after adding increases to

date—are still far below parity. For the last 10 years the promise of every political party has been parity for farm prices. The goal of every agricultural appropriation bill has been parity, and billions of dollars have been spent—millions of them in the last session alone—to attain parity for agriculture. Yet at the first start in the direction of parity the elaborate machinery of the Department of Justice and the vast influence of civic organizations are marshaled to block the long-sought increase. The Department of Agriculture's Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported last week that every agricultural product was selling below parity. Here is the table as it appeared in the departmental bulletin:

Prices of farm products

(Estimates of average prices received by farmers at local farm markets based on reports to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Average of reports covering the United States weighted according to relative importance of district and States)

Product	August 1939	Parity price, August 1939
Cotton, pound.....	8.7	15.5
Corn, bushel.....	45.7	80.2
Wheat, bushel.....	54.5	110.5
Hay, ton.....	6.77	14.84
Potatoes, bushel.....	69.1	85.3
Oats, bushel.....	25.4	49.9
Soybeans, bushel.....	.64	6.0
Peanuts, pound.....	3.39	6.0
Beef cattle, hundredweight.....	6.50	6.51
Hogs, hundredweight.....	5.47	9.02
Chickens, pound.....	13.0	14.2
Eggs, dozen.....	17.5	23.2
Butterfat, pound.....	22.4	30.6
Wool, pound.....	22.0	22.9
Veal calves, hundredweight.....	8.13	8.44
Lambs, hundredweight.....	6.94	7.34
Horses, each.....	78.00	170.80

¹ Adjusted for seasonality.

It is to be wondered that with the political platforms of all parties promising parity and the national policy as expressed in legislative enactments and Executive messages urging parity that the first marked step in that direction should meet with the recommendation of coercive legislation by the Department of Justice and the assurance by the Department of Agriculture that there were vast supplies on hand and no occasion for increases in prices.

Wheat sold at Liverpool on July 24, 1939, at the lowest price since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and only the support of appropriations by Congress prevented a like collapse in America. Lard sold last month at the lowest price in the history of the Chicago market. The index number of farm prices as reported by the Department of Agriculture went down from 96 in December 1938 to 88 in August 1939. In sections of the United States sharecroppers are living outdoors, with no school facilities for their children and no shelter for themselves against the approach of winter. Civilians hurrying home from war-torn Europe are not the only refugees. And yet when the products of the farmer's toil advance a few cents above the inadequate price he has been receiving the cry of "profiteer" goes up over the country, and Congress is asked to take drastic steps to prevent further increases.

The United States Conference of Mayors, well-intentioned gentlemen as they are, announce that pending "legislation to prevent Europe's war from being used as an excuse for unconscionable profiteering on foodstuffs" the cities which they represented would consider "establishing a clearing house in Washington where information regarding commodity prices could be exchanged and bulletins issued" with a view to preventing profiteering. An official of the Department of Justice told reporters that "the Department was receiving an average of 250 complaints a day on profiteering in foodstuffs," and even one farm organization in its official publication said:

Government officials are studying methods of preventing wartime profiteering in foodstuffs as complaints of sharp increases in prices pour in from all over the country.

And the amazing thing about all this profiteering is that the prices of all foodstuffs on which they are charged with profiteering is less today than they were 1 year ago.

Here is a table taken from Sunday's edition of the New York Times. It gives the prices in the New York retail markets, city-wide average retail price in the New York retail market, of each article of food September 23, 1938, and September 23, 1939:

Foodstuff	A year ago	Today
Smoked hams.....pound..	\$0.30	\$0.28
Pork loins.....do.....	.32	.29
Center chops.....do.....	.40	.38
End chops.....do.....	.30	.28

Pork was 6.8 percent more expensive last year than it is now. How is that for profiteering?—

Leg of veal.....pound..	\$0.40	\$0.31
-------------------------	--------	--------

Veal was 9 cents more expensive a year ago than now—

Rib roast.....pound..	\$0.32	\$0.31
Sirloin roast.....do.....	.42	.40
Chuck roast.....do.....	.26	.23
Porterhouse steak.....do.....	.48	.45
Round steak.....do.....	.41	.40
Sirloin steak.....do.....	.41	.39

Beef was 4.3 percent more expensive last year than this, and certainly gives no—affords no—grounds on which to bring charges against the farmer or threats of punitive legislation—

Leg of lamb.....pound..	\$0.28	\$0.26
Turkey.....do.....	.41	.35
Fowl.....do.....	.32	.29
Broiling chickens.....do.....	.31	.30

Poultry was 5.8 percent more expensive last year at this time. No one made any comment when it fell nearly 6 cents, and the departments of the Government were not concerned about the producer who was selling at a lower price than any other industry. But when it advances 3½ cents of the 6 cents it had lost, they are filled with anxious apprehension and announce to the press that they propose to appeal to Congress—

Grade A eggs.....dozen..	\$0.50	\$0.48
Grade B eggs.....do.....	.32	.29

Vegetables are reported by the Times as being 8.7 percent more expensive a year ago, and fruits were 18.3 percent below last year's prices.

And here is another item from the same paper:

PRICES OF MEATS LOWER, SUPPLIES ABUNDANT, AND SLAUGHTERING IS HEAVY

CHICAGO, September 24.—There is an abundance of all kinds of meat in packing-house coolers available to butcher-shop owners at the lowest prices in recent weeks, according to a review of the wholesale markets. The movement of beef, veal, pork, and lamb into retail channels in the next few days is expected to be the largest of the season as the result of increased slaughtering of all classes of meat animals.

Receipts of cattle, calves, hogs, and sheep at the Chicago Stockyards last week were largest since the week ended on May 6. There were 20 percent more than the average of the 2 preceding weeks, when farmers were holding shipments back pending the effects of the war on prices of livestock.

Wholesale prices for meats are 2 to 36 percent lower than they were for a few days immediately following the start of the war in Europe, and are 13 percent lower to 5 percent higher than a year ago. Live costs of meat animals last week ran mostly 3 to 6 percent lower than 2 weeks ago and 12 to 24 percent lower than in 1938.

The most severe decline from the peak of the "war market" was in pork and lamb. Top light pork loins went yesterday to butcher shops at \$19 a hundredweight, compared with \$30 at the high time, a drop of 36 percent.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri furnish for the RECORD the price of corn that has been complained of, as well as the prices for wheat, hogs, and lamb? Will he also show just how much these commodity prices have lacked being up to parity and the percentage of parity they were before all this talk started about profiteering, so far as foodstuffs are concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman make that suggestion. I shall include a table prepared last week by the Department of Agriculture, giving farm prices in August and up to the time of publication.

	1919-20	1933	August 1939	Parity price August, 1939
Wheat.....	\$3.40	\$0.49½	\$0.545	\$1.105
Corn.....	1.70	.23½	.457	.802
Oats.....	1.08	.16½	.254	.499
Cattle.....	18.75	.625	6.50	6.510
Hogs.....	28.00	3.80	5.47	9.020
Eggs.....	.80	.11½	.175	.232
Butterfat.....	.89	.20	.224	.306
Poultry.....	.46	.08½	.130	.142
Cotton.....	.39	.06	.087	.155

As has been indicated, none of these prices have reached parity.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend, who has always taken such deep interest in farm prices, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Does my colleague believe that until the prices received by the producer reach parity that there can actually be any profiteering?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There certainly has been no profiteering up to this time and the prospect is that the price of farm products will not in many instances reach even parity—certainly will not go above parity. Up to this time the farmer is profiteering on the consumer about like the chicken profiteers on the hawk.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I am not asking this question to reveal what I know, because I do not know. I cannot say how it will work. May I ask if there is not already in reserve practically every agricultural commodity that is included that may be released, if necessary, to offset any real upsurge in price such as has been complained of recently?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. That is the one fundamental fact in this whole situation, and it is worthy of note that the Department of Agriculture, having the interest of the underpaid farmer at heart, has been announcing to the press and to all who would listen ever since the European war opened that there is an ample supply of all food staples and no occasion for anybody paying an increased price—although the prices of all other commodities, already above parity, have been steadily rising from day to day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the objective of all legislation passed by Congress dealing with agriculture the achievement of parity prices? Until those prices are achieved, then the objective of the agricultural program has not been reached; so there cannot be any conflict in prices until they get up to parity level. Parity means a price for agricultural products which compares with what the farmer has to pay out.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Oklahoma states the case convincingly. Congress in the last session voted millions of dollars for the sole purpose of bringing agricultural prices up to parity and now when there is some little prospect of their reaching parity all the forces of the Government are brought into action to hold them below parity. It is, to say the least, inconsistent.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma. He believes in price fixing, but at least above the cost of production.

Mr. MASSINGALE. It seems to me from what the gentleman has said and read that the anxiety seems to be a fear over the statements made by the press that the farmer may get a little bit more than he has been getting for his farm produce during this wartime. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The releases carried in the newspapers would seem to justify that conclusion.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact we produce only one-third of the sugar we consume, in view of the fact after we made the world safe for democracy sugar was skyrocketed to 30 and 35 cents a pound, and in view of the fact sugar is now rising, does not the gentleman think we should about-face and let the American producers of sugar increase and expand production so that we will not be gouged by the Cuban sugar monopoly and the Wall Street international bankers which own the monopoly and be forced to pay 30 to 35 cents a pound for sugar?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The President has taken care of that situation by revising the quota and there is no prospect that we will be required to pay more than the parity price for sugar at this time.

Mr. PITTINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTINGER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks. After we attain parity prices, does not the gentleman believe that in connection with neutrality legislation we should have anti-war-profiteering legislation with reference to all materials?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is an excellent suggestion. And I am glad to note that the gentleman emphasizes "all" commodities. The farmer is not asking for high prices. He is asking for parity prices—for fair prices. And he is willing to limit his prices if everybody else will do likewise. But that is not the proposal. The charges of profiteering are leveled at the farmer alone, and specific legislation so far proposed contemplates fixing farm prices without reference to industrial prices or wage scales. I am glad to go along with the gentleman from Minnesota on his proposition that all be treated alike.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, one of the distinguished members of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman has demonstrated time out of number that he is the champion of the farmer, and a friend of the farmer in respect of the return the farmer receives for the commodities he produces. The position I understand the gentleman to take now is that there is no need even to think of considering antiprofitteering legislation as far as the farmer is involved. However, I do not take it that the gentleman means there may not be a need for antiprofitteering legislation as far as it pertains to the middleman, the processor, or the broker, those who come between the producer and the consumer. Am I right in that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is eminently correct. The farmer is as patriotic as anybody. He is ready to fix his prices any time the welfare of the Nation demands it. However, he does say that if you fix his prices and fix his wages, it is only fair that you fix the prices and the wages of everybody else, treating everybody alike; that you should fix all prices or fix none.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the author of more beneficial farm legislation than any other Member of the House.

Mr. JONES of Texas. As I understand the gentleman, he does not object in any way to antiprofitteering legislation, but makes the point that as long as prices are out of balance and the farmer's prices are below parity, there is no such thing as profiteering in the products of the farm; that until the prices of farm products reach the point of parity and

get on the basis of the same purchasing power they had when prices were properly balanced, there is no such thing as profiteering in the actual raw products of the farm.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Decidedly so.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Of course, the gentleman would not object to antiprofitteering legislation should the price of any product reach the point of profiteering and get out of balance, and if an attempt should be made to take the price out of its proper price picture and put it into profiteering realms.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not. And I thank the gentleman for his emphasis on that point. All agriculture asks is parity. And that once attained, you may freeze prices forever. Of course, if after parity is reached labor and industry again upset the apple cart by demanding and securing further increases, then the farmer will expect to keep pace with them by corresponding increases.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that the profiteering about which we hear so much may be the result, and usually is the result, of control by monopolies? Is it not true that seldom such legislation is required where producers have to sell in the open market, such as farmers and producers of copper? Their products only become subject to profiteering after they leave the producers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true; and unless subsidiary legislation is appended in the stabilization of prices the middleman will get the increase and the farmer will be left where he was. We saw that happen when we levied the processing tax on hogs. The packers first passed the tax back to the producer and then passed it on to the consumers. Then, when the Supreme Court held that whoever paid the tax was entitled to a refund, the packers claimed they had paid it themselves. They collected three times.

They collected from the producer, from the consumer, and from the Government. Therefore, if you fix prices the middleman must have attention. There must be legislation guaranteeing the farmer a fair price under the middleman's deduction.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I certainly agree with the gentleman's statement that the farmer is not receiving parity. I cannot see any reason why the departments do not turn their attention to the middlemen, or the monopolies, certainly, that make it possible for the consumer to be charged from 35 to 40 cents for pork chops when the farmer does not get over 10 cents for his hogs.

The same is true in the dairy industry. You are asked to pay 40 cents a pound for cheese that is 3 or 4 months old, whereas the farmer right now does not receive over 14 or 14½ cents for it. This spread is what keeps the farmer from getting parity and curtails the natural consumption. I believe this spread is what the departments should work on and allow the prices the farmers receive to go up at least to parity. This is why a group of us went down to the Department of Justice before we left and proved to them that there was a monopoly in the dairy industry. I believe Mr. Murphy has started to investigate this matter. The consumers ought to know that they are being gouged in this way and that the farmer is not getting anywhere near what he ought to have. As they operate now, according to the newspapers the farmer evidently is getting rich. The consumer should know that the farmer is not getting rich, that he is not getting parity. I believe it is the duty of the Department to protect the farmer and allow the public to know that he is not getting anywhere near parity prices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In confirmation of what the gentleman has said, I may say that it was shown this last month that the price paid by distributors for milk was less than the price they paid for labor. The middleman is getting a disproportionate share of the price paid by the consumer for dairy products. The Department of Justice might well give some attention to the exorbitant toll taken by processors and distributors in all lines of foodstuffs.

But the odd thing about all this anxiety to curb profiteering is that it is directed exclusively at agriculture—agriculture and agricultural products. No one seems to be concerned by the fact that while farm prices have not yet reached parity, the prices of other commodities, practically all other commodities—usually already above parity—have been advancing even more rapidly. You have but to glance at the headlines to note that all metals are up and still advancing unchecked and unproved.

Copper moved at 12 cents a pound yesterday, although producers withdrew from the market after selling their day's allotment.

The added climb in zinc concentrates' prices made the total rise in 2 weeks \$10.50.

That is a heavier increase than any we have seen on the farm.

Quicksilver prices doubled. Despite an advance to the highest level since the World War, buyers were able to get only 10 percent of the quantities they sought. Quotation here was \$160 per flask, which brought values to double the level quoted just before the outbreak of the war.

No farm product has doubled since the war started. But no charge of profiteering has been leveled at the purveyor of any of the minerals.

Ore prices jump sharply. Zinc advances \$8.50 a ton to \$40. Lead climbs \$6.48 to \$64.54. No. 1 heavy melting steels were quoted at \$22.50 a ton, up \$2.50 from the preceding week.

The stock extended yesterday's sharp gains.

War stocks lead market as price gains continue. Western Union made a new high. Bethlehem Steel gained more than two points. Douglas Aircraft rose more than two points. Chrysler was up.

Withdrawal of men's woolen and worsted lines from the market followed price advances up to 25 cents a yard. Summer clothing manufacturers are sending salesmen on the road with the new lines without prices.

Tanners in session at the Waldorf-Astoria intimate that new prices may be announced in the next few days, 2 days ranging one-half to 1 cent a foot above the level prevailing until noon yesterday, which had showed gains of from 4 to 6 cents since Labor Day.

The trend in interest rates as reported by one of the leading financial journals, indicated an increase up to this time of approximately 1 percent, a relative increase in proportion in comparison with the rates previously received out of all proportion to the moderate increases registered in the prices of agricultural products.

No one suggests profiteering—the farmer is the only producer mentioned in that connection and the only one it is proposed to regulate by law.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Tariff Commission a few years ago made an investigation of the cost of production of copper. The Commission found that copper cannot be produced for less than 13 to 14 cents per pound, including depletion and interest, and excluding these items the cost would be 9.93 cents per pound. And copper at 12 cents a pound is not such a price so as to enable producers to recoup their losses sustained when they were producing copper in Montana and elsewhere at 8 or 9 cents a pound. The President's statement that 12½ cents is a fair price for copper has had a serious effect in copper-producing communities—particularly where wages are regulated by the price of copper.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The point is that copper is going up more rapidly than wheat or other agricultural products. Yet they propose to restrict the agricultural prices but make no mention of copper.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If wheat went to \$2 a bushel today, the farmers would still be broke for years to come before they could pay their back taxes and the interest upon their indebtedness.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. And that is why the charge of profiteering is so absurd, and the distinction between farm prices and other prices so puzzling. Why make fish of one and fowl of the other?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Missouri, who is so well acquainted with the subject he is discussing, has opened this discussion here today. I wish to suggest to the gentleman this fact: It has been mentioned prominently in the last 3 or 4 or 5 months in the press of the country that during the time when wheat was selling at \$1.50 to \$2.40 a bushel, the price of bread was not materially higher than it is when wheat is selling for 50 or 60 cents a bushel.

Now, there is no necessity for any alarm on the part of those persons who are agitating that the Government or the Congress take action now to prevent profiteering, certainly, with respect to bread, is there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When wheat was selling at \$2.40 a bushel, a loaf of bread sold here in Washington at 10 cents, and when wheat was selling at 30 cents a bushel the same loaf of bread sold here for 10 cents. Wheat has a long way yet to go before we would get to a place where the price of a loaf of bread would be above 10 cents, although in the meantime the average wage of the Government worker in the District of Columbia is \$745 higher than it was when wheat was \$2.40 a bushel.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman explain why the Secretary of Agriculture, after an increase of \$5 a bale in cotton, made a public statement that the country need not be alarmed, that with the surplus of cotton nothing serious would happen? Nothing was said about the rise in the other commodities. There is a slight advance in farm prices. It looks as if those in charge of the administration of affairs are always ready to give out some report to the press rather than to boost the price of farm commodities, and I just ask the gentleman if he has ever given any thought to that procedure on the part of the Department of Agriculture in Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to reconcile the apprehension of the Department over the rise in the farm prices at this time and the press releases which have checked needed increases in cotton and many other farm commodities already selling at ruinous figures.

The contrast between the trend in farm prices and the union wage scales is even more striking. Let me again quote from President Green, and in commendation of the invaluable service he is rendering American labor. When agriculture takes a leaf out of labor's book and perfects its organization to a point where it can speak with similar authority it will have largely solved its most vexatious problems. President Green said a day or two ago:

"The federation had received complaints from all sections of the country against rising prices for commodities," Mr. Green said in a statement.

"This inexcusable form of exploitation really constitutes a wage cut for every American worker," he said. "The American Federation of Labor is convinced that these rising prices are unjustified. This trend must be stopped."

May I call the attention of my good friend, Mr. Green, and the labor organizations to the fact that when they begin to talk about fixing the price of farm products they are on dangerous ground, because when you begin to talk about freezing the price of farm products and fixing the price of food, you take up a subject which leads directly up to the fixing of wages. The two are inextricably related—the fixing of the scale of wages is right behind it.

Here is what another commentator says:

Organized labor is preparing to apply quick pressure for wage increases.

The union wage scale of all labor today is higher than it was when the farmer was getting \$2.40 for his wheat, \$24 for his hogs, and 60 cents a dozen for his eggs. Now, the intimation is—however accurate—that they are suggesting the restriction of farm prices—and eventually an increase of wage scales. We do not object to an increase in wages. The farmer believes in high wages and high prices, but his position is, if he must pay high wages, he should have a high price for his labor and for his products and a high return commensurate with that received by finance on his investment in his farm, his stock, his machinery and equipment.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. In the gentleman's discussion of labor's complaint or fear of profiteering on the part of the farmer, I believe it would be well for the gentleman to suggest to his friend, Mr. Green, that the farmer is receiving on an average an income of \$173 a year to about \$225 a year, whereas the industrial worker of the country has an annual income of \$908 a year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The union wage scale in the District of Columbia, for example, with which all of you are familiar—and the same is true throughout the country—today is the highest it has ever been in the economic history of this or any other nation.

Here are the statistics compiled by the departments:

Comparative wage scales per 8-hour day

	1920	1933	1938
Carpenters, general ¹	\$5.36	\$8.80	\$11.18
Painters, general ¹	5.20	9.92	10.91
Plumbers and gas fitters ¹	5.76	10.40	12.12
Electricians, inside wiremen ¹	5.52	10.56	12.35
Bricklayers, building ¹	6.24	11.44	13.18
Farmers, field hands ^{2,3}	2.84	.75	1.31

¹U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Economics.

²With board.

³Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to get a statement in the RECORD about relative prices of wheat and bread.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman, who is giving the country something to think about, which he always does when he speaks. When wheat was selling in Montana for 30 cents a bushel it went to the consumer in the form of loaves of bread at a price of \$6 or \$7, for a bushel of wheat makes about 56 loaves of bread. Today, with wheat selling around 80 cents, we find that for 56 loaves of bread the consumer pays the same price he did before. This shows simply that the farmer does not get anywhere near his proportionate share of what the consumer has to pay.

I also note that as a result of an examination by the Senate committee investigating monopolies we find the producers of other necessities of life receive 40 percent of the dollar which the consumer pays, and that 60 percent of that dollar goes to distribution. This is an inequitable amount; that is to say, the producers do not get their just share.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I do not want to lose the point brought out by our colleague the gentleman from Montana. He makes the point very clearly that the fault lies in the system of distribution. Should we not in our coming legislation on agriculture follow the commodity through to the

point of distribution? Should not legislation be directed to that point rather than taking the line that we have, of trying artificially to force up the price of foods?

It seems to me this Congress could well, at this time when we are taking our leisure, be considering the subject and to correct the evil so clearly brought out by our colleague from Montana.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If any control legislation of that character is submitted to this House, or if any control steps are taken by the administrative or executive departments they must include measures which will affect the result to which the gentleman refers. They must see that the farmer gets his fair share of the increase and that it is not all monopolized by the middleman, as the gentleman suggests.

A very great man in American history said, on a great crisis—perhaps no greater than the crisis which now confronts us:

I know of no lamp to guide my feet but the lamp of experience.

It behooves all who are interested in the welfare of agriculture, and the progress of the country as a whole, at this time to consider this situation in the light of our experience in the last war.

We saw them bring in a resolution to "protect" the farmer, to put a minimum price on his products, and, of course, the minimum price became the maximum price. The "minimum price" fixed for wheat was \$2.20 at Chicago, and wheat never went above that although the Secretary of Agriculture afterward testified that wheat would have gone to at least \$7.50 a bushel and probably \$10 a bushel. Steps were also taken by the Government to hold down the price of livestock.

With the machinery at their command and with the legislation passed by Congress, they held down the price of foodstuffs, but they allowed the price of every other commodity to go without let or hindrance. Oil was just as necessary to win the war as food. Fifty basic products were just as essential to win the war as food, yet they put their restraining hand on one thing only, on foodstuffs. There is a certain class of people who never learn by experience, but let us hope the American farmer does not belong to that class; that he will be alert to what is going on in this Chamber, to be certain he is not again "protected" by fixed prices while everybody else profiteers to his heart's content.

May I say again that the farmer does not object to legislation fixing prices, and he certainly has no objection to legislation controlling profiteering. He asks only that such prices and such legislative or administrative action be applied to all, and that measures taken affect everybody alike; that they apply to the things he must buy as well as to the things he has to sell. It is not necessarily high prices or low prices which affect the situation. It is relative prices. The farmer must have a relative price equal in its buying power, equal in its compensation of his labor to that of the rest of the great brotherhood which makes up the industry of the Nation.

That is the wish of the President of the United States, as indicated in the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1939.

I am in complete agreement with your attitude that the interests of agriculture should be given equal consideration with the interests of other industries in dealing with any situation growing out of this crisis. From information given me, farm prices are still considerably below parity and need to go higher to give a fair return to producers.

I think our problem just now is a double one—to do all we can to get farm prices up to fair levels and to keep them there, and at the same time to prevent profiteering at the expense of the consumer. On the one hand, I think this requires continuation of the farm program, so that we will be in a position to take the fullest advantage of every opportunity to increase farm income. On the other, I believe it includes the assurance that the consuming public, and not the profiteer, will get the benefit of the ample supplies that we now have and will continue to have.

Let me say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only the opportunity of the farm organizations but this is their challenge. It is a test of their ability to serve agriculture and the Nation. If the farm organizations are ever to justify their existence, if they are ever to justify the faith the American farmer has reposed in them, this is their opportunity. Unless in this crisis they can protect agriculture against

price discrimination and exploitation, unless they are able to secure for him equality of opportunity and compensation, and especially unless they can temper for him the bitter aftermath which must inevitably follow the close of the war, they are as the withered fig tree upon which the Master found no fruit. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE RELIEF PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has made a very able defense of the farmers of America. In these 2 minutes I want to say a couple of things about another group of people who got hit pretty hard by the so-called relief bill that Congress passed during the last session. Nobody will deny that there were a great many extremely experimental things in that bill, among others the provision that whenever anyone has been employed for 18 months on W. P. A. there should be an enforced lay-off of 30 days. I do not know what reports other Members have received with reference to this, but as far as I am concerned, I find that provision has hit just those people I said it would hit; namely, mothers with little children who cannot get a job elsewhere, and older men. I believe that provision, as well as certain other provisions of that act, could well be considered and changed. This could be done in a very short time. The Senate passed a very different provision than that passed by the House, and I have no doubt we could very readily agree on this question. I hope the leadership is not going to refuse to let us iron out, as a matter of justice, some of these provisions. I hope, while we are worried about democracy in Europe, we will not neglect to worry a little about democracy here at home. There are thousands of families now on relief because of cuts in public-works employment whose labor could well be used in connection with national resource conservation, national-defense work, in the real broad sense of that term, rural electrification and similar enterprises. This is no time to forget America. It is a time to demonstrate the wonderful nation our democracy can build.

I would point out further that at the time when the cost of living is going to inevitably rise this supposed security wage that these people are receiving for their work on W. P. A. is in many cases actually being reduced, and it occurs to me this is hardly just and fair. There again we have a job to do. I hope with all my heart that something can be done in the way of considering and correcting these matters. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: S. 2973. An act for the relief of Inez Gillespie; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 28, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1089. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 14, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1090. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 2, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Salt Fork of the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Cherokee, Okla., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted February 10, 1938, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted January 27, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1091. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 1, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Bay Center Channel, Willapa Harbor, Wash., extending from Palix River to Bay Center dock, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved June 20, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 7542. A bill to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 7543. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept real estate granted to the United States by the city of Miami, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7544. A bill to provide sound payment for goods sold to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 7545. A bill to prevent profiteering in war munitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7546. A bill to prevent the spread of foreign propaganda in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. Res. 304. Resolution for the relief of Alice Everett Cox; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 305. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 306. Resolution requesting certain information from the Export-Import Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 7547. A bill granting an increase of pension to Effie J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7548. A bill granting a pension to Josephine Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5432. By Mr. BARTON: Petition of Max Walther and sundry other citizens of New York City, requesting that existing neutrality laws not be terminated; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5433. Also, petition of William Lane and sundry other citizens of New York, opposing repeal of present neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5434. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Harrison Irvine and sundry other residents of New York City, opposing the repeal of the present neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5435. Also, petition of William Albert, of New York City, and sundry citizens of New York City, voicing their sentiments for modification of the neutrality law and the adoption of the cash-and-carry plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5436. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Howard C. Lane, of Wheeling, W. Va., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5437. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Memorials of Dr. Howard B. Baker and other citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging repeal of the embargo on war supplies and the enactment by Congress of the so-called cash-and-carry plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5438. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition containing signatures of 120 persons residing at Garfield, N. J., demanding that the United States be kept strictly neutral and opposing cash-and-carry bills of any kind; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5439. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mira Patterson, of Azusa, Calif., and 43 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5440. Also, petition of Andrew Nelson, of Montebello, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5441. Also, petition of Edward R. Volk, of Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5442. Also, petition of N. Price, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5443. Also, petition of Clyde O. Angevine, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5444. Also, petition of John Fulton, of Pacific Palisades, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5445. Also, petition of Hazelle E. Cook, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5446. Also, petition of August Butke, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5447. Also petition of Frank Kaspar, of Torrance, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5448. Also, petition of Herbert G. Odell, of Arcadia, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5449. Also, petition of Peter J. Ney, of Sonora, Calif., and nine others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5450. Also, petition of Jennie Wolfe, of Pomona, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5451. Also, petition of Charles Rothas, of Alhambra, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5452. Also, petition of Leonard R. Currie, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5453. Also, petition of Sabilla Marshall, of San Francisco, Calif., and 25 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5454. Also, petition of Mary J. Frye, of San Francisco, Calif., and three others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5455. Also, petition of Loraine J. Hatton, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5456. Also, petition of O. R. Williamson, of Long Beach, Calif., and 17 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5457. Also, petition of David Schwartz, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency

Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5458. Also, petition of Vesta A. Olmstead, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 22 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5459. Also, petition of Fay M. Stark, of North Hollywood, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5460. Also, petition of C. Sorensen, of Pasadena, Calif., and 6 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5461. Also, petition of Frank F. Newell, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 28 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5462. Also, petition of C. C. Owen, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5463. Also, petition of Nelson Beeler, of Long Beach, Calif., and 19 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5464. Also, petition of John Edward Brown, of Pomona, Calif., and 30 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5465. Also, petition of Abraham Lincoln, of Yorba Linda, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5466. Also, petition of Albert Quened, of Santa Barbara, Calif., and 16 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5467. Also, petition of Jennie Brooks, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5468. Also, petition of J. L. Harrison, of Fullerton, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve

banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5469. Also, petition of Mauro Scardigno, of Alameda, Calif., and 15 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5470. Also, petition of John R. Culbertson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 69 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5471. Also, petition of Arthur H. Heyer, of Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5472. Also, petition of Adam Lankard, of Colfax, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5473. Also, petition of Maurice Glant, of Banning, Calif., and five others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5474. Also, petition of Mrs. Clise Gehanaler, of Los Angeles, Calif., and one other, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5475. Also, petition of Helene Nodden, of Oakland, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5476. Also, petition of Louis L. Hoyle, of Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5477. Also, petition of William A. Morrison, of Monrovia, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5478. Also, petition of James E. Littlefield, of Morris Bay, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5479. Also, petition of C. Jensen, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5480. Also, petition of Dick B. Lithgaw, of Wilmar, Calif., and five others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5481. Also, petition of Joseph E. McDonald, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5482. Also, petition of B. Carlson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 14 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5483. Also, petition of Ida M. Walker, of Pasadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5484. Also, petition of Fred W. Cunningham, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5485. Also, petition of A. G. Smith, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5486. Also, petition of Cornelius J. Clanson, of Sacramento, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5487. Also, petition of Joseph A. Haverlandt, of Oakland, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5488. Also, petition of Thomas Newman, of Yucaipa, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5489. Also, petition of Nancy J. Lilyard, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 26 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency

Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5490. Also, petition of E. L. Rice, of Pomona, Calif., and 18 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5491. Also, petition of Frank Boksic, of Los Angeles, Calif., and seven others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5492. Also, petition of Mae B. Kitchens, of Anaheim, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5493. Also, petition of Anthony Palladino, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5494. Also, petition of Benjamin Strandstrea, of Altadena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5495. Also, petition of Alice Bingham Staton, of Alta Loma, Calif., and 10 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5496. Also, petition of Herman Hansen, of Gardena, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5497. Also, petition of Albert Grey, of Inglewood, Calif., and 59 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5498. Also, petition of Henry H. Hayden, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5499. Also, petition of Ethel R. Mayhew, of Turlock, Calif., and 13 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5500. Also, petition of Mrs. Dadami, of Suisun, Calif., and 18 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary

powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5501. Also, petition of Edwin R. Nieland, of Bangor, Calif., and 22 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5502. Also, petition of Alexander Corless, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5503. Also, petition of F. H. Dunbar, of Inglewood, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5504. Also, petition of Elmer E. Hunt, of Tujunga, Calif., and 17 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5505. Also, petition of Maud Lane, of Oakland, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5506. Also, petition of Henry D. Dinkean, of Oakland, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5507. Also, petition of Sage O. Rosmusseu, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 22 others, endorsing House bill 4931, providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5508. Also, petition of Phil Garvey, of San Francisco, Calif., and 30 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5509. Also, petition of Joe Barugroove, of La Verne, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5510. Also, petition of Milita S. Baugh, of Ocean Park, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5511. Also, petition of W. R. Newbury, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve

banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5512. Also, petition of Charles Kemey, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 24 others, endorsing House bill 4931 providing for Government ownership of the stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and for the exercise by Congress of its constitutional monetary powers; requesting the Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on the said bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5513. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Works Progress Administration and revision of the Woodrum bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5514. Also, petition of the Rotary Club of Baltimore, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the U. S. frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5515. Also, petition of the National Council, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to patriotic measures; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5516. Also, petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to our liberty, American institutions and ideals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5517. Also, petition of the One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Infantry Memorial Post, No. 357, American Legion, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Grant us, dear Lord, to pass this day in serenity and peace, without stumbling and without shame, and help us to repel every thought of discontent and self-seeking, that we may cultivate magnanimity, charity, and the habit of holy silence.

Make us diligent in our appointed service and faithful to every trust, that this day may be to us fruitful in high endeavor for peace and good will among men and nations.

Finally, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report, grant that with one accord we may think on these things to do them. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 21, 1939, and Monday, September 25, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker pro tempore of the House during the absence of the Speaker.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Thomas M. Eaton, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-